

[W]hether the specific risks of prejudice and possible confusion [are] overborne by the risk of inconsistent adjudications of common factual and legal issues, the burden on parties, witnesses and available judicial resources posed by multiple lawsuits, the length of time required to conclude multiple suits as against a single one, and the relative expense to all concerned of the single-trial, multiple-trial alternatives.

*Id.* (quoting *Hendrix v. Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.*, 777 F.2d 1492, 1495 (11th Cir. 1985)).

Here, while there are common questions of law and fact amongst Plaintiffs' actions, there will also likely be distinct factual allegations, given that the actions involve two individual Plaintiffs. There is some risk of prejudice or confusion in trying two individuals' discrimination cases in one action where there are two separate sets of circumstances leading to each individual's termination. Given that the cases are proceeding under similar schedules, the Parties should be able to consolidate discovery such that much of the expenses of potentially duplicative litigation will not need to be expended, even though the cases will proceed separately.

The factors to be considered weigh against consolidation. Defendant's Motion to consolidate is hereby **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 4th day of January, 2017.

**s/ S. Thomas Anderson**  
S. THOMAS ANDERSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE